arXiv:1209.3386v2 [hep-ph] 22 Nov 2012

Semileptonic D decays up to speed

Giulia Ricciardi[1, 2, *]

[1] *Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Università di Napoli Federico II*
Complesso Universitario di Monte Sant'Angelo, Via Cintia, 80126 Napoli, Italy
[2] *INFN, Sezione di Napoli,*
Complesso Universitario di Monte Sant'Angelo, Via Cintia, 80126 Napoli, Italy

We discuss the very recent surge of progress in semileptonic D decays, thus underlining promising new directions of development. We focus on the impact on light flavour spectroscopy and estimate mixing parameters in the $\eta - \eta'$ system.

PACS numbers: 13.20.Fc
Keywords: Standard Model, QCD, charm

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past decade, charm decays have not received the same first-rate attention than beauty decays, but they are rapidly gaining ground. A great shove has been the first evidence for CP violation in neutral D meson decays, provided by LHCb and confirmed by CDF, which has displayed a size of the asymmetry, almost a percent, unexpectedly large. Detailed and comprehensive analyses of charm transitions provide us with new insights into nonperturbative dynamics of QCD. Besides, they can help calibrating theoretical tools for B studies. Experimental facilities as Babar and CLEO have produced copious amount of data, while BESIII and LHCb are still collecting larger and larger samples of charmed hadrons. The future flavour factories will probably pursue charm measurements to their ultimate precision. We analyze the impact of the latest progress on semileptonic charm decays, and focus on the consequences for the $\eta - \eta'$ system. In Section II we review recent developments in exclusive and inclusive decays. In Section III we use recent data and new lattice results for evaluating mixing angles. In order to complete the panorama of recent advances, we briefly discuss rare D decays in Section IV. Conclusions follow in Section V.

II. EXCLUSIVE AND INCLUSIVE DECAYS

One way to extract the CKM elements $|V_{cd}|$ and $|V_{cs}|$ is through leptonic decays $D^+_{(s)} \to l^+\nu$. The decay rates depend on the product of the modulus of the CKM factor and of the decay constant $f_{D_{(s)}}$, therefore the theoretical input on $f_{D_{(s)}}$ allows a determination of the CKM element. However, the comparison between experimental and theoretical results presents some hardships. Experimental disadvantages come from the helicity suppression of the leptonic decays and the comparatively high rate of the process $D^+_{(s)} \to l^+\nu\,\gamma$. For decays into tauons, these effects appear to be small, while the helicity suppression is mostly broken. The presence of new physics, namely a charged Higgs or leptoquarks, can substantially change the decay widths. A mild discrepancy still persists between the experimentally determined ratio of decay constants $f_{D_s^+}/f_{D^+}$ and some of its lattice computations, although it has been steadily shrinking in the determinations of the last few years.

Exclusive semileptonic decays can be called to the rescue by supplying complementing informations. They are not helicity suppressed, still they retain the possibility of theoretical simplification by factorizing the leptonic current. They are tree level dominated and new physics is generally not expected (at least to a high degree of accuracy). The extraction of $|V_{cd}|$ and $|V_{cs}|$ follows in the footsteps of the more studied extraction of $|V_{ub}|$ and $|V_{cb}|$ from semileptonic B decays[1].

The differential ratios for the semileptonic decays of a charmed meson D_q into a pseudoscalar meson P is parameterized in terms of only one form factor $F_1(q^2)$, when the lepton masses are neglected, according to the formula

$$\frac{d\Gamma(D_q \to Pl\nu)}{dq^2} = \frac{G_F^2}{24\pi^3}|V_{cq}|^2\,|\bar{p}_P(q^2)|^3|F_1(q^2)|^2 \tag{1}$$

---

[*] Electronic address: giulia.ricciardi@na.infn.it

[1] For a very recent review on semileptonic B decays, see [1], to which we refer for notations and comparisons with the beauty sector.

where $q_\mu \equiv p_{2\mu} - p_{1\mu}$, with $p_{1\mu}$, m_{D_q} and $p_{2\mu}$, m_P being respectively momenta and masses of the initial and final meson, and $|\bar{p}_P(q^2)| = \sqrt{(m_{D_q}^2 + m_P^2 - q^2)/(2m_{D_q}) - m_P^2}$. The form factors $F_{1,0}(q^2)$ parameterize the transition matrix element as

$$< P(p_2)|J_\mu|D_q(p_1) >= F_1(q^2)\left[(p_1+p_2)_\mu - \frac{m_{D_q}^2 - m_P^2}{q^2}q_\mu\right] + F_0(q^2)\frac{m_{D_q}^2 - m_P^2}{q^2}q_\mu \tag{2}$$

Only the vector part of the V-A current J_μ contributes to the transition among the pseudoscalar mesons. To avoid the presence of a spurious singularity at $q^2 = 0$, and for kinematic reasons, $F_1(0) = F_0(0)$ holds.

For the sake of simplicity, one can split the non perturbative evaluation of the form factors F_1 and F_0 in 2 into two steps, the evaluation of their normalization at $q^2 = 0$ and the determination of their q^2 dependence. The form factors are expected to decrease at low values of q^2, that is at high values of spectator quark recoil. That is because, in the leading spectator diagram, the probability of forming an hadron in the final state decreases as the recoil momentum of the spectator quark increases. Moreover, the form factors are expected to be analytic functions everywhere in the complex q^2 plane outside a cut extending along the positive q^2 axis from the mass of the lowest-lying $c\bar{q}$ resonance. That implies they can be described by dispersion relations, whose exact form is not known a priori, but can be reasonably assumed to be dominated, at high q^2, by the nearest poles to $q^2_{\rm max} = (m_{D_q} - m_P)^2$. Pole dominance implies current conservation at large q^2. We expect the form factors to have a singular behavior as q^2 approaches the lowest lying poles, without reaching them, since they are beyond the kinematic cutoff. The simplest parameterization of the q^2 dependence motivated by this behavior is the simple pole model, where a single pole dominance is assumed. By restricting to the form factor $F_1(q^2)$, we have

$$F_1(q^2) = \frac{F_1(0)}{1 - \frac{q^2}{m^2_{\rm pole}}} \tag{3}$$

In $D \to \pi l\nu$ decays, the pole for $F_1(q^2)$ corresponds to the $c\bar{d}$ vector meson of lowest mass $D^\star$. In $D \to Kl\nu$ and $D_s \to \eta^{(\prime)}l\nu$ decays, the poles correspond to the $c\bar{s}$ vector mesons and the lowest resonance compatible with $J^P = 1^-$ is $D_s^{*\pm}$, with mass $M_{D_s^*} = 2112.3 \pm 0.5$ MeV [2]. Recently, form factor fits have been performed for $D \to K(\pi)l\nu$ by the CLEO [3] and the BESIII Collaborations (preliminary, [4]), where several models for the q^2 shape have been considered. In the simple pole model, agreement with data is only reached when the value of $m_{\rm pole}$ is not fixed at the $D^\star_{(s)}$ mass, but is estimated as a free parameter. In order to take into accounts higher poles, while keeping the number of free parameters low, a modified pole model has been proposed [5], where

$$F_1(q^2) = \frac{F_1(0)}{\left(1 - \frac{q^2}{m^2_{\rm pole}}\right)\left(1 - \alpha\frac{q^2}{m^2_{\rm pole}}\right)} \tag{4}$$

Another common parameterization, known as the series or z-expansion, is based on a a transformation that maps the cut in the q^2 plane onto a unit circle in another variable, z, and fits the form factor as a power series (in z) with improved properties of convergence [6–8].

Lattice and QCD sum rules are the more common routes toward the evaluation of the form factor normalization. Lately, high statistics studies on the lattice have become available. The HPQCD Collaboration has estimated the value of $|V_{cd}|$ with experimental input from CLEO [3] and, more recently, the value of $|V_{cs}|$ with additional inputs by BaBar [9, 10], Belle [11] and BESIII (preliminary, [4]). Also other D and D_s decays, such as $D_s \to \phi\, l\,\nu$ or $D \to \pi\, l\,\nu$, have been analyzed [12]. The estimate $|V_{cd}| = 0.225 \pm 0.006_{\rm exp} \pm 0.010_{\rm lat}$ [13], with the first error coming from experiment and the second from the lattice computation, is in agreement with the value of $|V_{cd}|$ the same collaboration has recently extracted from leptonic decays and from determinations of $|V_{cd}|$ coming from neutrino scattering; also total errors are comparable. Instead, their best, preliminary value $|V_{cs}| = 0.965 \pm 0.014$ [12] shows a discrepancy with the average value from leptonic decays $|V_{cs}| = 1.010 \pm 0.017$ [14]. Both $|V_{cs}|$ and $|V_{cd}|$ semileptonic estimates are in agreement with indirect fits. Experiments at BESIII, together with experiments at present and future flavour factories, have all the potential to reduce the errors of the measured decay branching fractions of $D^+_{(s)}$ and D^0 leptonic and semileptonic decays, in order to allow more precision comparison of these CKM matrix elements. In particular BESIII is actively working on semileptonic charm decays and new results are expected soon [14].

It is interesting to observe that, according to lattice determinations in [12], the form factors are insensitive to the spectator quark: $D_s \to \eta_s l\nu$ and $D \to Kl\nu$ form factors are equal within 3%, and the same holds for $D_s \to Kl\nu$ and $D \to \pi l\nu$ within 5%. This result, which can be tested experimentally, is expected by heavy quark symmetry to hold also for B meson decays so that $B_s \to D_s$ and $B \to D$ form factors would be equal.

QCD light-cone sum rules have also been employed to extract $|V_{cs}|$ and $|V_{cd}|$ [15], giving substantial agreement on the averages and higher theoretical error with respect to the previously quoted lattice results. By using the same data and a revised version of QCD sum rules, errors on $|V_{cd}|$ have been reduced, but an higher average value has been obtained: $|V_{cd}| = 0.244 \pm 0.005 \pm 0.003 \pm 0.008$, the first and second errors being of an experimental origin and the third being due to the theoretical uncertainty [16].

Form factors for semileptonic transitions to a vector or a pseudoscalar meson have also been investigated within a model which combines heavy quark symmetry and properties of the chiral Lagrangian [17–19].

The most recent experimental results on inclusive D^0 and $D^+_{(s)}$ semileptonic branching fractions have been derived by using the complete CLEO-c data sets [20]. Besides being important in their own right, these measurements, due to similarities between the D and B sectors, can be helpful to improve understanding of B semileptonic decays, with the hope to reduce the theoretical uncertainty in the determination of the still debated weak mixing parameter $|V_{ub}|$. In [20], knowledge about exclusive semileptonic modes and form factor models are used to extrapolate the spectra below the 200 MeV momentum cutoff. The ratios of the semileptonic decay widths are determined to be $\Gamma^{\rm SL}_{D^+}/\Gamma^{\rm SL}_{D^0} = 0.985 \pm 0.015 \pm 0.024$ and $\Gamma^{\rm SL}_{D^+_s}/\Gamma^{\rm SL}_{D^0_s} = 0.828 \pm 0.051 \pm 0.025$. The former agrees with isospin symmetry, while the latter ratio shows an indication of difference. Significant improvements of the branching ratio measurement $\mathcal{B}(D \to X\mu^+\nu_\mu)$ can be expected at BESIII, because of advantages provided by the capabilities of the BESIII μ detection system [21]. The $D^{0,\pm}$ and D_s inclusive decays are differently affected by weak annihilations (WA) diagrams, since they are Cabibbo suppressed in the $D^\pm$ case, Cabibbo-favoured in D_s decays, and completely absent in D^0 decays. The semileptonic decays of D and D_s can be helpful in constraining the WA matrix elements that enter the $B \to X_u\, l\bar{\nu}$ decay, via heavy quark symmetry. By comparison of measured total semileptonic rates or moments in these channels, we can hope to extract information on WA contributions. The "theoretical background" to take into account is the fact that such contributions compete with additional ones arising from $SU(3)$ breaking in the matrix elements, and/or from non-valence WA contributions. However, no relevance or clear evidence of WA effects have been found considering the semileptonic widths [22] or the widths and the lepton energy moments [23].

III. LIGHT FLAVOUR SPECTROSCOPY

Semileptonic D decays play also a role in better understanding the η and η' wavefunctions. The transitions $D^+_s \to \eta^{(\prime)} l^+\nu$ and $D^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} l^+\nu$ are driven by weak interactions on the Cabibbo-allowed and Cabibbo-suppressed levels, and provide us with complementary information, since they produce the $\eta^{(\prime)}$ via their $s\bar{s}$ and $d\bar{d}$ components, respectively. In addition, $\eta^{(\prime)}$ could be excited via a gg component. That is important, since it would validate for the first time an independent role of gluons in hadronic spectroscopy, outside their traditional domain of mediating strong interactions. Also B decays, semileptonic or hadronic, have been similarly employed (see e.g. [24, 25]). The experimental evidence of the existence of the glueballs, their spectra and their proprieties, are searched for in a variety of processes at several experiments, e.g. BESIII and PANDA.

Data on charm semileptonic decays have existed since 1995, when CLEO extracted the branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(D^+_s \to \eta^{(\prime)} e^+\nu_e)$ from ratios to hadronic decays of the D^+_s [26]. In 2009 the first absolute measurement of $\mathcal{B}(D^+_s \to \eta^{(\prime)} e^+\nu_e)$ [27] and the first observation of the $D^+ \to \eta\, e^+\nu_e$ decay [28] were reported by the same collaboration. Improved branching fraction measurements, together with the first observation of the decay mode $D^+ \to \eta' e^+\nu_e$ and the first form factor determination for $D^+ \to \eta\, e^+\nu_e$, followed in 2011 [29].

The simplest parameterization of the mixing, including the gg component, can be expressed in the heavy quark basis in terms of two mixing angles ϕ and ϕ_G. Estimates based on QCD sum rules suggest that the coupling of the gluonium to the η' is larger than its coupling to η [30], which is also mainly an $SU(3)_{fl}$ octet. By neglecting for simplicity the gg component in the η state, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta'\rangle &\simeq \cos\phi_G \sin\phi|\eta_q\rangle + \cos\phi_G\cos\phi|\eta_s\rangle + \sin\phi_G|gg\rangle \\ |\eta\rangle &\simeq \cos\phi|\eta_q\rangle - \sin\phi|\eta_s\rangle \end{aligned} \qquad (5)$$

in the quark-flavor basis, where the quark content of the isoscalar nonstrange and strange wavefunctions, assumed with the same radial component, are $|\eta_q\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|u\bar{u} + d\bar{d}\rangle$ and $|\eta_s\rangle = |s\bar{s}\rangle$.

In the last few years, several lattice results have become available for the values of mixing angles [31, 32], at about a decade of distance from the first estimate by UKQCD [33]. They are all in agreement, quoting values of ϕ between 40° and 50°, with errors slightly lower than the ones from phenomenological determinations. The latest analysis, by ETM, leads to a value of $\phi = (44 \pm 5)^\circ$ [34], with statistical error only. Systematic uncertainties, difficult to estimate on lattice, are likely to affect this result. Out of chorus are the lower value favoured by the recent UKQCD staggered investigation [35], $\phi = (34 \pm 3)^\circ$, and the large (preliminary) results by the QCDSF Collaboration [36] giving a mixing angle $\theta \sim -(7^\circ, 8^\circ)$ in the octet-singlet basis, that is, in the quark-flavour basis, $\phi = \theta + \arctan\sqrt{2} \sim 54^\circ$. All lattice analysis do not include a gluonic operator, discussing only the relative quark content.

Mixing angles extracted from lattice QCD should be compared with theoretical determinations from phenomenology, which also allow estimates of the gluonic content. Phenomenological analysis of semileptonic decays presented in [24] results in $\phi \sim 40^\circ$, with theoretical and experimental uncertainties which are comparable and total errors ranging from 2% to 10%. The estimate of ϕ_G is at the moment dominated by the experimental errors which prevent any conclusion on the gluonic content of the $\eta - \eta'$ system. There is clearly room for improvement on both the experimental and theoretical sides.

In this work, we estimate the values of mixing angles from semileptonic D decays, employing recently available data and some status of art theoretical determinations of form factors. The extraction from semileptonic D decays has the potentiality to become increasingly more important, e.g. employing new data we expect from BESIII or from future Super Flavour factories.

In the past literature, the knowledge of the mixing angle was sometimes used to compensate missing estimates, by relating $D^+_{(s)} \to \eta e^+ \nu_e$ and $D^+_{(s)} \to \eta' e^+ \nu_e$ decays. For instance, in QCD sum rule calculations of form factors [37] only the form factor $F_1^{D_s \to \eta}$ is directly available, and $F_1^{D_s \to \eta'}$ is obtained, given ϕ, from the ratio

$$\frac{\left| F_1^{D_s \to \eta}(q^2) \right|}{\left| F_1^{D_s \to \eta'}(q^2) \right|} = \tan\phi \tag{6}$$

derived directly from Eqs. 5 in the absence of gluon contributions. However, as shown in [24], estimates of the angle ϕ may suffer of a residual dependence on the model and the processes used for its extraction, not easy to quantify, the simplest example being the variation due to the inclusion or the exclusion of the mixing with the gluonic component. As of today, newly available shapes of the form factors allow to extract directly the mixing angle values from semileptonic D decays. Preliminary lattice determinations for $F_{1,0}(q^2)$ have been provided by the HPQCD [12] and for $F_0(q^2)$ by the QCDSF Collaboration [36]. Disconnected diagrams, which may account for mixing with gluonium, have been taken into account in [36] only, and their effect has been found not negligible. More precise calculations are awaited for, but we can already obtain preliminary phenomenological estimates of the mixing angles. A first immediate value comes by comparing at $q^2 = 0$ the lattice determination of $F_1(0) = F_0(0) \sim [0.72 - 0.78]$ [12] with the QCD sum rule calculation of $F_1^{D_s \to \eta}(0) = 0.50 \pm 0.04$ [37]. The form factor $F_1(q^2)$ calculated on lattice [12] does not refer to the physical meson, but to a pseudoscalar lattice construction made of a strange quark and anti-quark, since only the connected contributions to the D meson semileptonic decay form factor have been calculated. It is found to be almost the same than the form factor $F_1(q^2)$ for the $D \to K$ decay and at each q^2 it can approximately represent the form factor of transition to the η_s part of the η-η' wavefunctions. The form factor $F_1^{D_s \to \eta}(0)$ in [37] refers to the physical state, therefore according to Eqs. 5 we find

$$\frac{\left| F_1^{D_s \to \eta}(0) \right|}{\left| F_1^{D_s \to \eta_s}(0) \right|} = \sin\phi \tag{7}$$

which gives $\phi \sim 41^\circ$ with an error of about 8 % . It is remarkable that, in the basic previous approximations and by using two different theoretical approaches, we obtain the right order of magnitude of the mixing angle, with an error that is large, but comparable with errors from other determinations at lower energy, e.g. ϕ extractions employing $\psi \to \rho/\omega/\phi + \eta^{(\prime)}$ two body strong decays.

As already mentioned in Sect. II, the WA process may affect semileptonic meson decays [38, 39]. The observed differences in $D^{\pm,0}$ and D_s semileptonic widths [20] may in part be originated by the valence spectator quark contributions in D_s decays, since they are Cabibbo suppressed and absent in the $D^\pm$ and D^0 decays, respectively. The WA effects compete with the ones originated by $SU(3)$ breaking effects in the matrix elements of operators that contribute significantly to the total rates. At low q^2, the WA contributions start at order $1/m_c^3$, while at high q^2 numerically sizable WA contributions to inclusive rates may be expected from nonperturbative dynamics, overcoming the helicity suppression [38]. An analysis based on inclusive semileptonic D decays, which considers both the widths and the lepton energy moments, shows no clear evidence of WA effects, i.e. the description in terms of OPE reproduces well the experimental data [23]. Based on the previous results, we neglect possible WA contributions in Eq. 7 at $q^2 = 0$ and at the current level of precision. While WA might affect the corresponding inclusive semileptonic width only moderately, it should impact the exclusive channels $D_s^+ \to \eta' l^+ \nu$ and $D^+ \to \eta' l^+ \nu$ on the Cabibbo-favoured and suppressed levels via the η''s gluonic component. The strength of the effect depends on two factors, namely, the size of the gg component in the η' wave function and on how much gg radiation one can expect in semileptonic D_s^+ and D^+ decays. Lastly, since the main effect might come from the interference with the spectator amplitude, it can a priori enhance or reduce those rates. The form factor values at high q^2 on lattice have not yet been determined directly [12, 36], but have been extrapolated using the single pole model and the z-parameterization, respectively. In the following, we make the reasonable assumption that small WA additions only affect the size of the leading amplitude through mixing, in a percentage that is within the errors we already consider. We maintain the possibility of additional contributions from gluonic components only in the form of the simple parameterization 5.

By using the CLEO first absolute measurement of the branching fractions of $\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} e^+ \nu)$ [27], we can write the ratio

$$\left.\frac{\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu_e)}{\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \eta e^+ \nu_e)}\right|_{\mathrm{CLEO}} = 0.36 \pm 0.14 \tag{8}$$

which corresponds to

$$\frac{\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu_e)}{\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \eta\, e^+ \nu_e)} = \frac{\int_0^{(m_{D_s}-m_{\eta'})^2} dq^2\, |\bar{p}_{\eta'}(q^2)|^3\, |F_1(q^2)^{D_s\to\eta_s}|^2}{\int_0^{(m_{D_s}-m_{\eta})^2} dq^2\, |\bar{p}_{\eta}(q^2)|^3\, |F_1(q^2)^{D_s\to\eta_s}|^2} \cot^2\phi \cos^2\phi_G \tag{9}$$

To calculate the explicit form of the ratio one has to model the q^2 dependence of the form factors; we have considered the lattice points for $F_1^{D_s\to\eta_s}$, as plotted in [12], and a model extrapolation to the full range. The errors have been taken conservatively, as the maximum errors read on the plot, in both the coarse and fine lattice. The assumption of pole dominance seems to be more tenable in the case of D than of B decays, since the q^2 range is smaller, a few GeV against about 25 GeV. Our fit has been performed on both the simple pole model 3 and the modified pole model 4. In the single pole model, our estimate gives $m_{pole} = 1.88 \pm 0.02$. This value is not very different from the value estimated by CLEO [3] in the $D^+ \to \bar{K}^0 e^+ \nu_e$ case, that is $m_{pole} = 1.95 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.01$, where the errors are statistical and systematic. Such similarity was expected, since it is a consequence of the approximate independence on the spectator quark recently exposed by the lattice result $F_1^{D_s\to\eta_s}(q^2) \sim F_1^{D^+\to K^0}(q^2)$ within 3% [12]. In the case of the modified pole model, we estimate $\alpha = 0.36 \pm 0.04$, to be compared with $\alpha = 0.28 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.02$ in the $D^+ \to \bar{K}^0 e^+ \nu_e$ decay [3].

Since Eq. 9 is affected, even in this simple approach, by the gluonic component of the η' wavefunction, we prefer to consider a slightly different ratio, the one between Cabibbo favoured and Cabibbo suppressed widths, which is independent of the angle ϕ_G

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu_e)/\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \eta\, e^+ \nu_e)}{\Gamma(D^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu_e)/\Gamma(D^+ \to \eta\, e^+ \nu_e)} &= \frac{\int_0^{(m_{D_s}-m_{\eta'})^2} dq^2 |\bar{p}_{\eta'}(q^2)|^3 |F_1(q^2)^{D_s\to\eta_s}|^2}{\int_0^{(m_{D_s}-m_{\eta})^2} dq^2 |\bar{p}_{\eta}(q^2)|^3 |F_1(q^2)^{D_s\to\eta_s}|^2} \times \\ &\times \frac{\int_0^{(m_D-m_\eta)^2} dq^2 |\bar{p}_{\eta}(q^2)|^3 |F_1(q^2)^{D\to\eta_q}|^2}{\int_0^{(m_D-m_{\eta'})^2} dq^2 |\bar{p}_{\eta'}(q^2)|^3 |F_1(q^2)^{D\to\eta_q}|^2} \cot^4\phi\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Last year, CLEO collaboration presented the first observation of $D^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu$, with branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu) = (2.16 \pm 0.53 \pm 0.07)$ x 10^{-4}, and an improved $\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to \eta e^+ \nu) = (11.4 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.4)$ x 10^{-4} [29]. From data, we get

$$\left.\frac{\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu)}{\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to \eta e^+ \nu)}\right|_{\mathrm{CLEO}} = 1.9 \pm 0.9 \tag{11}$$

The sizable error is due to the large error in 8, which in turn follows from the large statistical uncertainty in what is the first determination of $\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu_e)$. The statistical error is expected to reduce with future data; by a reduction of just one half, the error in 11 shrinks to about 20%. In 10, we consider the same $F_1^{D_s\to\eta_s}(q^2)$ employed in Eq. 9. No direct lattice points are available at the moment for $F_1^{D\to\eta_q}(q^2)$, still lattice provides the interesting result of the independence from the spectator quark $F_1^{D_s\to K}(q^2) \sim F_1^{D\to\pi}(q^2)$ [12]. All these processes are Cabibbo suppressed and single out the non-strange components of the wavefunctions, therefore is reasonable to assume $F_1^{D\to\pi}(q^2) \sim F_1^{D\to\eta_q}(q^2)$. We include the small dependence on the spectator quark in the theoretical error, and extrapolate to the full q^2 range by using the simple and the modified pole models. The parameter estimates give $m_{pole} = 1.9 \pm 0.2$ and $\alpha = 0.21 \pm 0.04$. By comparing Eq. 10 with the experimental data, we obtain

$$\phi = (41 \pm 3)^\circ \tag{12}$$

To be conservative, we have used the different parameterizations in q^2 as an additional maximum theoretical error, but its effects, as the effect of the theoretical errors in the parameters of the models, are negligible with respect to the

Decays	ϕ
$\phi/\rho/\omega \to \gamma\eta^{(\prime)}$ + $\eta' \to \gamma\,\rho/\omega$ [44]	$(41.4 \pm 1.3)^\circ$
$\phi/\rho/\omega \to \gamma\eta^{(\prime)}$ + $\eta' \to \gamma\,\rho/\omega$ + $\pi^0/\eta' \to \gamma\gamma$ [43]	$(40.4 \pm 0.6)^\circ$
$\psi \to \rho/\omega/\phi\,\eta^{(\prime)}$ [45]	$(44.6 \pm 4.4)^\circ$
$\psi \to \rho/\omega/\phi\,\eta^{(\prime)}$ [46]	$(46^{+4}_{-5})^\circ$
$D_s^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} e^+\nu$ [42]	$(37.7 \pm 2.6)^\circ$
$D_{(s)}^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} e^+\nu$ (this work)	$(41 \pm 3)^\circ$

TABLE I: *Comparison between some determinations of the mixing angle ϕ, obtained in different processes and approaches, all of them allowing for a non zero gluonium component.*

experimental error in 8. New expected data will allow a substantially more accurate determination. It is remarkable the agreement with other determinations from semileptonic decays based on different phenomenological approaches and older data [24, 40–42]. The agreement extends also to extractions from other strong and electroweak processes at lower energy, as can be seen in Table I. By combining the result 12 with Eq. 9 one can at the most obtain an upper limit on the mixing angle ϕ_G which is about 40°, but any conclusion on the gluonic content is prevented by the large size of the actual experimental error.

In the vector sector, we do not expect the mixing ϕ–ω to be as large as in the pseudoscalar sector, because there is no additional mixing induced by the axial $U(1)$ anomaly. In the absence of mixing, the state ω has no strange valence quark and corresponds to $|u\bar{u} + d\bar{d}\rangle/\sqrt{2}$. D_s Cabibbo-favored semileptonic decays are expected to lead to final states which can couple to $|\bar{s}s\rangle$, in the quark flavour basis. The decay $D_s^+ \to \omega e^+\nu_e$ occurs through ϕ–ω mixing and/or WA diagrams, where the lepton pair couples weakly to the $c\bar{s}$ vertex. In the hypothesis of WA dominance and using factorization, the corresponding branching fraction was estimated to be $(0.13 \pm 0.05)\%$ [47]. Experimentally, only an upper limit is available at the moment, limiting the branching fraction to less than 0.20% at 90% CL [48].

Semileptonic D decays also offer the chance to explore possible exotic states. An interesting channel is the $D_s^+ \to f_0(980)\,l^+\nu$ decay, where experimental results have been provided for the first time by CLEO in 2009 [49]. The nontrivial nature of the experimentally well-established $f_0(980)$ state has been discussed for decades and there are still different interpretations, from the conventional quark-antiquark picture, to multiquark or molecular bound states. The channels $D_{(s)}^+ \to f_0(980)\,l^+\nu$ can be used as a probe on the hadronic structure of the light scalar resonance, for recent studies see [50–53]. A further handle is given by the possibility to correlate observables related to the charm semileptonic branching ratios with theoretical and experimental analyses of the hadronic $B_s \to J/\psi f_0$ decay [54, 55].

IV. RARE DECAYS

The decays driven by $c \to u l^+ l^-$ are forbidden at tree level in the standard model (SM) and proceed by one loop diagram at leading order in the electroweak interactions. Virtual quarks in the loops are of the down type, and no breaking due to the large top mass occurs. The GIM mechanism works more effectively in suppressing flavour (charm) changing neutral currents (FCNC) than their strangeness and beauty analogues, leading to tiny decay rates, dominated by long distances effects. On the other side, we expect possible enhancements due to new physics to stand out, once we exclude potentially large long-distance SM contributions.

In the SM, a very low branching ratio has been estimated for inclusive decays, largely dominated by long distance contributions $\mathcal{B}(D \to X_u e^+e^-) = \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{LD}}(D \to X_u e^+e^-) \sim O(10^{-6})$ [56]. Long distance contributions are assumed to proceed from intermediate vector resonances such as $D \to X_u V$, $V \to l^+l^-$, which set the scale with branching fractions of order 10^{-6}. Short distance contributions lay way behind, with an estimated branching ratio $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{SD}}(D \to X_u e^+e^-) \sim 4 \times 10^{-9}$ [57]. Handling long distance dynamics in these processes becomes equivalent to handing several intermediate charmless resonances, in larger number than in the case of B mesons analogues. Their effect can be separated from short-distance contributions by applying selection criteria on the invariant mass of the leptonic pair.

To consider exclusive decays, let us start from $D_{(s)}^{\pm} \to h^{\pm} l^+ l^-$, with $h \in (\pi, \rho, K, K^\star)$ and $l \in (e, \mu)$, none of which has been observed up to now. The best experimental limits on branching ratios are $O(10^{-6})$ or higher, at 90% confidence level (CL), coming all from Babar [58], with a few exceptions: the branching ratios of $D^+ \to \pi^+\mu^+\mu^-$ decays, given by DØ [59], of $D^+ \to \rho^+\mu^+\mu^-$ decays and $D_s^+ \to K^{*+}(892)\mu^+\mu^-$ decays, with very old limits $O(10^{-4})$ given by E653 [60]. BESIII collaboration expects to be able to reach a sensitivity of $\sim 10^{-7}$ for $D^+ \to K^+/\pi^+\, l^+l^-$ at 90% CL with a 20 fb^{-1} data sample taken at the $\psi(3770)$ peak [21]. The LHCb collaboration can also search for $D_{(s)}^{\pm} \to h^{\pm} l^+ l^-$ decays. With an integrated luminosity corresponding to 1.0 fb^{-1}, upper limits on the D^+ (D_s^+) modes are expected close to 10^{-8} (10^{-7}) at 90% CL [61]. Also decays $D^0 \to h^0 l^+ l^-$ have not been observed yet; best experimental limits at 90% CL are of order $O(10^{-5})$ or higher, and are given by older analysis of CLEO [62], E653 [60] and E791 [63]. Future Super B factories expect to reach a sensitivity of $O(10^{-8})$ on a 90% CL on various rare decays, including $D^+ \to \pi^+ l^+ l^-$ and $D^0 \to \pi^0 l^+ l^-$ [64].

A way to disentangle possible new physics (NP) is to choose appropriate observables containing mainly short distance contributions. This year, hints of possible NP have been advocated in the charm sector to explain the non vanishing direct CP asymmetry in $D^0 \to K^+ K^-$ and $D^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-$, measured by LHCb and confirmed by CDF. Encouraged by these results, effects of the same kind of possible NP have been looked for in other processes, included rare charm decays. CP asymmetries can be generated by imaginary parts of Wilson coefficients in the effective Hamiltonian for $c \to u l^+ l^-$ driven decays. They have been investigated in $D^+ \to \pi^+ \mu^+ \mu^-$ and $D_s^+ \to K^+ \mu^+ \mu^-$ decays, around the ϕ resonant peak in spectrum of dilepton invariant mass, concluding that in favorable conditions their value can be as high as 10% [65]. Older studies report investigations of semileptonic decays in the framework of other NP models, such as R-parity violating supersymmetric models, extra heavy up vector-like quark models [66], Little Higgs [57], and leptoquark models [67]. The parameter space discussed in older analyses cannot take into account the constraints given by recent LHC data, most notably the discovery of the 125 GeV resonance. In several cases, a reassessment in the updated framework could be used advantageously.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The charm sector has a vital role in pinning down the value of critical parameters of flavour physics. We have briefly reviewed the most recent developments in both inclusive and exclusive decays, focusing on the most promising in the light of ongoing and future data collections. In particular, in the sector of charmed decays into η and η', there have recently been two major advances, the measurements of all the relevant branching ratios and the lattice direct evaluation of the form factor shapes. Both are still at a preliminary stage but allow to put phenomenological estimates on a more systematic ground. More accurate determinations are expected, which we hope to prompt: the time seems ripe for precise light flavour analysis through semileptonic D decays. We have discussed a simple framework that keeps approximations under control and can be systematically extended as far as new expected data become available. Our estimate value for the mixing angle $\phi = (41 \pm 3)^\circ$ is in agreement with previous determinations.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Issaku Kanamori for interesting discussions.

[1] G. Ricciardi, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **27** (2012) 1230037.
[2] J. Beringer *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 010001.
[3] D. Besson *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 032005.
[4] C. Liu, arXiv:1207.1171 [hep-ex].
[5] D. Becirevic and A. B. Kaidalov, hep-ph/9904490.
[6] T. Becher and R. J. Hill, Phys. Lett. B **633**, (2006) 61.
[7] M. C. Arnesen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** (2005) 071802.
[8] C. Bourrely, I. Caprini, and L. Lellouch, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 013008.
[9] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 052005.
[10] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 051101.
[11] L. Widhalm *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **97** (2006) 061804.
[12] J. Koponen, C. T. H. Davies and G. Donald, arXiv:1208.6242 [hep-lat].
[13] H. Na, C. T. H. Davies, E. Follana, J. Koponen, G. P. Lepage and J. Shigemitsu, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 114505.
[14] G. Rong, arXiv:1209.0085 [hep-ex].
[15] A. Khodjamirian, C. Klein, T. Mannel and N. Offen, Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 114005
[16] Z.-H. Li, N. Zhu, X.-J. Fan and T. Huang, JHEP **1205** (2012) 160.
[17] S. Fajfer and J. F. Kamenik, Phys. Rev. D **71** 014020 (2005).
[18] S. Fajfer and J. F. Kamenik, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 034029.
[19] S. Fajfer and J. F. Kamenik, Phys. Rev. D **73** (2006) 057503.
[20] D. M. Asner *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010) 052007.
[21] D. M. Asner *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **24** (2009) S1-794.
[22] Z. Ligeti, M. Luke and A. V. Manohar, Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010) 033003.
[23] P. Gambino and J. F. Kamenik, Nucl. Phys. B **840** (2010) 424.

[24] C. Di Donato, G. Ricciardi and I. Bigi, Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012) 013016.
[25] R. Fleischer, R. Knegjens and G. Ricciardi, Eur. Phys. J. C **71** (2011) 1798.
[26] G. Brandenburg et al. [CLEOII Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 3804.
[27] J. Yelton et al. [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 052007.
[28] R. E. Mitchell *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** (2009) 081801.
[29] J. Yelton *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 032001.
[30] F. De Fazio and M. R. Pennington, JHEP **0007** (2000) 051.
[31] N. H. Christ *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105** (2010) 241601.
[32] J. J. Dudek, R. G. Edwards, B. Joo, M. J. Peardon, D. G. Richards and C. E. Thomas, Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011) 111502.
[33] C. McNeile *et al.* [UKQCD Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **491** (2000) 123 [Erratum-ibid. B **551** (2003) 391].
[34] K. Ottnad *et al.* [ETM Collaboration], arXiv:1206.6719 [hep-lat].
[35] E. B. Gregory *et al.* [UKQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 014504.
[36] G. S. Bali *et al.* [QCDSF Collaboration], PoS LATTICE **2011** (2011) 283.
[37] P. Colangelo and F. De Fazio, Phys. Lett. B **520** (2001) 78.
[38] I. I. Y. Bigi and N. G. Uraltsev, Nucl. Phys. B **423** (1994) 33.
[39] S. Bianco, F. L. Fabbri, D. Benson and I. Bigi, Riv. Nuovo Cim. **26N7** (2003) 1.
[40] T. Feldmann, P. Kroll and B. Stech, Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 114006.
[41] M. Gronau, J.L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011) 034025.
[42] V. V. Anisovich, D. V. Bugg, D. I. Melikhov, V. A. Nikonov, Phys. Lett. B **404** (1997) 166.
[43] F. Ambrosino et al. [KLOE Collaboration], JHEP **0907** (2009) 105.
[44] R. Escribano and J. Nadal, JHEP **05** (2007) 006.
[45] R. Escribano, Eur. Phys. J. **C65** (2009) 467.
[46] C. E. Thomas, JHEP **0710** (2007) 026.
[47] M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 074006.
[48] L. Martin *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 012005.
[49] K. M. Ecklund *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 052009.
[50] W. Wang and C.-D. Lu, Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010) 034016.
[51] M. R. Pennington, AIP Conf. Proc. **1257** (2010) 27.
[52] A. H. Fariborz, R. Jora, J. Schechter and M. Naeem Shahid, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 094024.
[53] N. N. Achasov and A. V. Kiselev, arXiv:1206.5500 [hep-ph].
[54] S. Stone and L. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 074024.
[55] R. Fleischer, R. Knegjens and G. Ricciardi, Eur. Phys. J. C **71** (2011) 1832.
[56] G. Burdman, E. Golowich, J. L. Hewett and S. Pakvasa, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 014009.
[57] A. Paul, I. I. Bigi and S. Recksiegel, Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011) 114006.
[58] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 072006.
[59] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **100** (2008) 101801.
[60] K. Kodama *et al.* [E653 Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **345** (1995) 85.
[61] I. Bediaga *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], arXiv:1208.3355 [hep-ex]].
[62] A. Freyberger *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** (1996) 3065 [Erratum-ibid. **77** (1996) 2147].
[63] E. M. Aitala *et al.* [E791 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 3969.
[64] D. Asner, eConf C **070805** (2007) 41 [arXiv:0711.3044 [hep-ex]].
[65] S. Fajfer and N. Kosnik, arXiv:1208.0759 [hep-ph].
[66] S. Fajfer, N. Kosnik and S. Prelovsek, Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 074010.
[67] S. Fajfer and N. Kosnik, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 017502.